

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 112024-0051 7856 F. DEVON TAYLOR 09/07/1999 09/390,954 **EXAMINER** 06/15/2006 21186 7590 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. **CUFF, MICHAEL A** P.O. BOX 2938 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

3627

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)		Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/390,954	TAYLOR ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Michael Cuff	3627		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) 又	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 April 2006</u> .				
·		2b)⊠ This action is non-final.			
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate)-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added limitation requiring communication between the accounting support services and the printer agent and printer occurs over the Internet is new matter. Applicant refers to transmission medium 150 as support for communication over the Internet. Applicant's printer has been disclosed as communicating over the Internet. However, the recited limitation requires that the accounting support services and the printer agent must also communicate with each other over the Internet. Figure 3 shows the communication occurring within the same server. Page 8 lines 19-20 of applicant's specification recites that accounting application 320 registers with the printer agent 330 via a conventional interface, not the Internet or transmission means 150.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The independent claims have been amended to include requiring communication between the accounting support services and the printer agent and printer occurs over the Internet. It is not clear from the claim language if communication between all three elements must be done over the Internet. From the original disclosure, it would appear applicant meant communication between the accounting support services and the printer occurs over the Internet, and communication between the printer agent and the printer occurs over the Internet. The examiner will prosecute the application accordingly.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. in view of Moore.

Bennett et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying that the accounting support services are external to and separate from the printer agent and

Art Unit: 3627

the printer and that communication between the accounting support services and the printer occurs over the Internet, and communication between the printer agent and the printer occurs over the Internet.

Bennett et al. shows, figures 7 and 8, a printing system with automatic statistical compilation and billing. There is a section, Statistical and Billing Information, in columns 5-8 which is of particular interest. The system described above may include several print jobs in memory (path, second print service) since jobs can be scanned at one time and then stored for subsequent printing. The system controller 7 (printer agent) can include a mechanism for identifying each account and counting the number of reprographic system functions performed for that specific print job (accounting support for print services, third print service). The system controller 7 can also store the billing rates for the various system functions for each account and calculate the billing cost for that account, as for example, the product of the rate for the printing function and the number of printing functions performed (tracking/evaluating). All information to be inputted into the controller 7 can be accomplished using the UI 52 (API). When a customer account has been deactivated by the system operator, requests to bill against the account will be denied. Printing jobs already in the printer queue that reference the account will be allowed to print, and will subsequently be billed to the account. A system operator can look at the print job summary or delete a print job with a deactivated account name. However, a new account name must be assigned to the original job in order to move or copy it (inherently, accept, reject, and hold functions are accomplished)

Art Unit: 3627

The examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the elements separable if it were considered desirable for any reason to do so. The case law is from a mechanical background, but in the computer environment, it is desirable to make units modular or separable in order to facilitate programming and interface management. Also note that the Bennett et al. controller is already divided into many parts, (column 4, lines 19-23) it just does not specify the accounting.

Based on the discussion above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Bennett et al. system to separate, and thus apart, different functions in order to facilitate programming and interface management.

Moore teaches an anti-counterfeiting system where a remote printer is used via the Internet (column 11, lines 33-36) to eliminate problems associated with counterfeiting and diversion, which begin at the manufacturer site.

Based on the teaching of Moore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Bennett et al. system to remotely locate printer 8, via the Internet, for high security items in order to eliminate problems associated with counterfeiting and diversion, which begin at the manufacturer site.

Art Unit: 3627

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Luff 6/9/06 Michael Cuff June 9, 2006